

4B C1
A
Cont

a mitigating effective amount of at least one nonionic surfactant selected from alkylpolyglycoside compounds;
0.1 – 8%wt [0.1 – 10%wt.] of [a] at least one further nonionic surfactant;
0 - 3%wt. of a polymeric cationic surfactant based on a polyquaternary ammonium salt;
0 - 3%wt. of a builder;
0 - 5%wt. of one or more conventional additives particularly coloring agents, fragrances and fragrance solubilizers, viscosity modifying agents such as thickeners, pH adjusting agents and pH buffers including organic and inorganic salts; and,
water to form 100%wt. of the concentrate form of the inventive compositions.

Please cancel claim 3 without prejudice.

Please cancel claim 10 without prejudice.

REMARKS:

Regarding objections to the claims, and the claim rejections under 35 USC 112:

The amendments to the claims being entered herein are believed to address and overcome the grounds of rejection and/or objection.

The applicant traverses the objection raised by the Office as to the use of the applicant's term "effective amount" as used in the claims. The applicant believes that the use of this term in the claims is proper, as it is fully supported by the teaching of specification which accompanies the claims. The attention of the Office is respectfully directed to the decision in In re Halleck 164 USPQ 647, 649 (CCPA, 1970) wherein the Court of Custom and Patent Appeals noted in its decision that: "The use of "effective amount" language is appropriate; those skilled in the art will be able to determine from the written disclosure and its examples what an effective amount [for growth] is;" Turning to applicant's claims, each use of the term "effective amount" is used for a specific component, which component provides a specific technical effect. Attention is drawn the use of the term "effective amount" as used in the context of the claim: a